REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 13 and 17-19. Claims 1 and 11 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. Claims 2, 4-6, 10, 12 and 14-16 remain cancelled. New claim 23 is added.

Thus, claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 13, 17-19 and 23 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION:

In the outstanding Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 11 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5 and 12 of U. S. Patent No. 7,131,577 (Obara) and U. S. Patent No. 7,025,255 (Drummond).

Claims 1 and 11 are also rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3 and 12 U.S. Serial No. 11/103,450 ('450) in view of Drummond.

Since claims 1 and 11 of the instant application have not yet been indicated as allowable, it is believed that any submission of a Terminal Disclaimer or arguments as to the non-obvious nature of the claims would be premature. MPEP § 804(I)(B).

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Applicants be allowed to address any obviousness-type double patenting issues remaining once the rejection of the claims is resolved and that the rejection be reconsidered in light of the claims presented above.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS:

In item 5 on page 5 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to claims 1 and 11, due to informalities.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 11 have been amended, and no longer include the language in the form objected to by the Examiner.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102:

In item 7 on page 6 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 13, and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Drummond. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of the remaining claims for at least the reasons

set forth below.

Claim 1 recites "a browser having a plurality of synchronous method programs for each processing of said transaction operations which synchronously controls said plurality of I/O units", where the browser "calls up corresponding one of said synchronous method programs designated by a method name of said script and said applet tag, each called method program issuing I/O commands to said plurality of I/O controllers, synchronously controlling said plurality of I/O units designated by said called method program, and receiving a reply from said plurality of I/O units."

Applicants respectfully submit that <u>Drummond</u> does not disclose or suggest at least the above-identified feature of claim 1. See also claim 11 reciting similar features.

<u>Drummond</u> discusses a Web type ATM that a browser calls a method according to a script of an object embedded in the screen contents and the called method executes operation of I/O units. As shown in Fig. 52 of <u>Drummond</u>, the sync-object 284 synchronizes a plural objects (for example, a dispenser object and a print object).

In contrast to <u>Drummond</u>, the claimed invention calls for an object which synchronously controls a plural I/O unit itself, which is patentably distinguishable from an object that synchronizes <u>a plural objects</u> as indicated in <u>Drummond</u>.

Moreover, according to the claimed invention, the method of the sync agent is <u>directly</u> called by the applet tag and the script. While, in <u>Drummond</u>, the sync-object is called and the called sync object controls synchronously the plural objects.

Therefore, <u>Drummond</u> does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of the Applicants' independent claims. Since <u>Drummond</u> does not disclose the features recited in the independent claims, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims patentably distinguish over <u>Drummond</u>, and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claims depend from the independent claims include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by <u>Drummond</u>. For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over <u>Drummond</u>. The dependent claims are also independently patentable.

For example, claim 7 recites, "said control unit specifies said plurality of I/O units for which synchronization is controlled by said method program according to input parameters

attached to said script." <u>Drummond</u> does not teach or suggest these features of the claimed invention because the ATM object of <u>Drummond</u> produce synchronous events related to multiple objects.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM:

New dependent claim 23 has been added to recite, " a corresponding command is issued to control one of said plurality of I/O controllers matching the method name contained in said script and said applet tag of the screen content to implement said transaction operation".

It is submitted that new claim 23 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _06/08/2011_

By: _Temnit Afework_
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501